(1) Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
992014 JUN 15 2000
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. _____

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner.

PETITIONER MARIA PRESENTS QUESTIONS OF RIGHTS BEFORE THE HIGH COURT WHEN STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS HAVE MOVED IN CONFRONTATION TO THE CONSTITUTION AND THE LAWS OF THE LAND, TO ESTABLISH SEGREGATION ON THE RIGHTS OF A WOMAN

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Fifth Circuit
Rule 10(c)

FIRST IMPRESSION CASE

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro se
1517 Garcia St.
Laredo, Texas 78040
(956/723-6925)

33pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

It is that Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez, is before the Supreme Court of the United States for the ninth (9th) time with the same questions presented – that of severe violations of rights by state and federal courts upon a woman, and the Supreme Court of the United States ignores the questions before the court, because the presentation before the court comes from a woman as Pro se approaching the court.

It is that along more then twenty (20) years Petitioner Maria has been in all levels of Texas courts and all levels of[1] federal courts pleading for her rights to Equal Protection of the Law, pleading for her liberty and freedom rights equal for all, but every Texas and federal court has failed to move by liberties and freedoms Equal for All.

Petitioner Maria's last Questions before the High Court, are:

1. [2]What power does the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit have, to move publicly and by documentation to deprive a woman of her citizen rights to Equal Protection of the Law and to her liberty and freedom rights.

2. What power does the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit, and all its courts in its jurisdiction, have, to prohibit a woman from approaching such courts as Pro se, when the US Constitution and the Laws of the Land do not

---

[1] See Lodgings.

[2] See Appendix A, p. A-1-2.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED – Continued

impose such segregation upon the women of the land.

3. Why was Petitioner Maria not advised by Texas Courts and Federal Courts, that a woman as Pro se before such courts, would be totally devoid of every liberty right and would be severely and inhumanly punished.

4. Why was Petitioner Maria terrorized by Sheriff officers for 24 hours, with promises of "Bodily Harm", until forced to sign false confessions, and denied Miranda Rights.

5. Why was Petitioner Maria forced to go before a jury totally selected by one side, the prosecution.

6. Why did judges move to bring about a final judgment by hearing only one side, and Petitioner Maria denied her right to a fair hearing.

7. What power do judges have to defraud Petitioner Maria of her ranch, and hand it over to criminal trespassers, when Petitioner Maria is the only legal owner of her ranch.

8. What power do judges and attorneys have to blackmail and impose extortion of large amounts of money upon Petitioner Maria.

9. What power do state and federal judges have to conspire with gangster corporations (TransTexas Corp. and alias), to defraud Petitioner Maria of her mineral gas and mineral royalties.

10. Under what Legislation decree has the law profession moved to take over and control the

QUESTIONS PRESENTED – Continued

courts of the nation by imposing that a woman before the courts as Pro se, shall be devoid of all rights, shall be threatened, robbed of her property and her rights, stigmatized as of "mental illness", and silence her voice forever.

ORAL ARGUMENT BEFORE THE COURT

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez, approaching the Court as Pro se, petitions the Court for Oral argument before the Court, so as to expose, with documented evidence, how state and federal courts, severely violate even the basic rights to a fair hearing, to a woman approaching the courts as Pro se.

It is that as of July 2, 1990, while Petitioner Maria was a main party in federal court, guns-for-hire, moved in the middle of the night to kill Maria, and such criminals shouted into the night, "You shall never speak out again", but Maria escaped. The local police and the FBI refuse to investigate.

It is that as of April 11, 2000, the United[3] States Court of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit, declared by documentation that Maria Graciela Ramirez would be BARRED from ever approaching such court of appeals, and from ever approaching any of the courts within the jurisdiction of the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit, which includes all federal district courts in Texas, in Mississippi, and in Louisiana, thus Maria Graciela Ramirez being devoid of her Citizen Rights by the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit because Maria approached the courts as Pro se.

---

[3] See Appendix A, p. A 1-2.

ORAL ARGUMENT BEFORE THE COURT – Continued

It is that Petitioner Maria Graciela Ramirez petitions the Supreme Court of the United States to move before the Court in Oral Presentation.

/s/ Maria Graciela Ramirez
Maria Graciela Ramirez
Petitioner Pro se

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Questions Presented i

Oral Argument Before The Court iv

Table of Contents..... vi

Table Of Authorities..... vii

Opinions Below 2

Jurisdiction..... 3

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved... 3

Statement Of The Case 4

Reasons For Granting The Writ 5

Conclusion 6

APPENDIX

Appendix A

U.S. Court of Appeals – Dismissed A1

Petitioner Questions The Dismissal.....A3

Appendix B

Attorneys Order To The Court (To Defraud a woman of her Rights) B1

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

Petitioner Questions the power of attorneys..... B6

Petitioner Before The Court..... B8

Lodgings: Separate Cover

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASE CITED:

First Impression Case (On women segregated of Rights By the Courts of the nation)..... *passim*

STATUTE CITED:

28 U.S.C. § 1654..... 1

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION CITED:

U.S. Const. amend II 3

U.S. Const. amend IV..... 3

U.S. Const. amend V 3

U.S. Const. amend VI.....4, 5

U.S. Const. amend XIV 1, 4, 7

U.S. Const. art. VI, § 2 4

OTHER:

Dred Scott Case – Segregation of Rights (U.S. Supreme Court, March 6, 1857)..... 8

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FIFTH CIRCUIT RULE 10(c)

FIRST IMPRESSION CASE

Before The Honorable Court:

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez, as Pro se, moves before the High Court of the Nation, for the ninth time, with the same issue of how all levels of state and federal courts refuse[4] to accept a woman as pro se before the courts, and defrauding Petitioner Maria of every right to a fair hearing, and every right to Equal Protection of the Law – thus, the state and federal courts in confrontation to the 14th Amendment Rights of Due Process and Equal Protection of the Law, and in confrontation to the Law of the Land, identified as U.S.C. Title 28, § 1654 – Appearance personally or by counsel – In all Courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel.

It is thus, that along more than twenty years, Texas courts and federal courts have denied to Petitioner Maria her Right to Due Process of Law (a fair and impartial hearing) – have denied to Petitioner Maria her Right to Equal Protection of the Law (to protect her property, to protect her life, to protect her liberty rights) – have

[4] See Lodgings

denied to Petitioner Maria the Law of the Land that declares that the parties before the courts can approach the courts *personally* – and yet the state and federal courts have viciously moved to attack Petitioner Maria with sanctions (extortion), and now as of April 11, 2000 the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit has devoided Maria Graciela Ramirez[5] of her citizenship rights to liberty and freedom rights *Equal For All.*

OPINIONS BELOW

It is that the Opinions Below consist of the most extensive documented evidence in the history of the United States of America, that exposes the most severe abuse of rights upon a woman citizen and upon the elderly, by all levels of state and federal courts in the nation.[6]

It is that the Opinion Below, rendered by the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit, as of April 11, 2000, declares, by documentation, that a woman approaching the courts as Pro se, to defend her rights and her property will be publicly BARRED from the courts and severely and inhumanly punished, thus, Democratic Doctrines of Equality banished by the Courts.

---

[5] See Appendix A, p. 1-2

[6] See Lodgings

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Chapter 81 Supreme Court, § 1254 Courts of Appeals: Certiorari: Appeal: Certified questions.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Petitioner Maria indicates to the Court to refer back to the *eight* presentations before the Court for more specific information on the violations of Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved.[7]

1. U.S. Constitution – Amend. II – The right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed – Such right was denied to Maria with severe inhuman punishments.–

2. U.S. Constitution – Amend. IV – The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches shall not be violated – Such right was denied to Maria with terror and torture procedures.

3. U.S. Constitution – Amend. V – nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself (herself), nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law – Such right was denied to Maria (in a sham prosecution of false arrest), and Maria forced, under threat, to be a witness against herself.

[7] See Lodgings

4. U.S. Constitution – Amend. VI – In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an *impartial jury* – In the sham prosecution Maria was forced to go before a jury totally selected by the prosecution, thus the state of Texas (as the prosecution) directly attacking the Democratic form of government and its Constitution, and establishing a Fascist government within its courts.

5. U.S. Constitution – Amend. XIV – No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the *equal protection of the law* – Such rights to life, liberty, property, and equal protection have been denied to Maria by Texas judges and federal judges, and documented evidence verifies such segregation of rights upon Maria.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

U.S. Constitution – Article VI, § 2 – This Constitution and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance Thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, Shall be the Supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby: anything in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

It is that the Supreme Court of the United States has the obligation and duty to interpret the Constitution and

to protect and defend the Constitution and the Laws of the Land to be *Equal For All.*

It is that in the presentations of Petitioner Maria before the Court there is open evidence, by documentation, that state and federal judges have moved to establish segregation of rights because of gender (female) identity – and thus, the court judges (state and federal) moving in confrontation to Article VI, § 2 of the U.S. Constitution, and in confrontation to the Democratic Doctrines of liberties and freedoms *Equal For All.*

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

It is that as of U.S. Supreme Court Rule 10(c) within Jurisdiction on Writ of Certiorari, such indicates that – a state court or a United States court of appeals has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court.

It is that for more than twenty years, state and federal courts have severely abused Maria of her constitutional rights and her rights to the Laws of the Land that are guaranteed to be Equal For All.

It is that not only has Maria been robbed by the courts of her constitutional rights to Equal Protection of the Law, but on orders of state and federal courts (judges) Maria has been robbed of her legal property, and has been imposed with blackmail, extortion, terror and torture procedures and now, as of April 11, 2000, the United

States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit has moved to declare, by documentation,[8] that Maria Graciela Ramirez has been BARRED from approaching the courts as Pro se, thus moving, publicly, to devoid Maria of all her citizenship rights, and firmly establishing Segregation of Rights upon any woman that approaches the courts as Pro se.

It is that the U.S. Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit has moved further in their attack upon the rights of Maria by threatening Maria with severe punishments of sanctions, like the lower courts have imposed upon Maria.[9]

It is also to be noted that attorneys have given the ORDERS to Judges (by documentation),[10] to defraud Maria of her rights to ever approach the courts again, thus criminals, gangster companies, can now move to rob a woman of her property and of her rights, with the courts as partners-in-crime.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner Maria Graciela Ramirez, moves before the High Court for the ninth time, pleading for the return of her citizenship rights that were voided on April 11, 2000 in a vicious and malicious conspiracy of judges, signed by judges of the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit.

---

[8] See Appendix A, p. A-1-2

[9] See Appendix A, p. A-1-2

[10] See Appendix B, p. B-1-4

It is that the issue at hand of the Maria case, clearly and by documentation, exposes the severe segregation of rights by the courts, upon a woman that approaches the courts as pro se to defend her rights, life, liberty and property – so severe is the segregation now firmly established by the courts of the nation, that it equates to the voided citizenship rights by the courts upon the Negroid people, starting in the lower courts of Missouri in 1846 and ending with the infamous U.S. Supreme Court decision of March 1857 whereby the Negroid people were segregated of all their citizenship rights because of race.

It is that in the Maria Case, the courts of the nation have now openly and publicly declared that the women of the nation shall remain in bondage without Equal Rights.

It is thus, that Petitioner Maria, approaches the Supreme Court of the United States for the last time, to question the High court – on what power do the lower courts have to defraud a woman of her citizenship rights to approach the courts as pro se and to demand her rights to Equal Protection of the Law, which is a Guarantee Constitutional Right Equal For All.

It is that when the courts of the nation move in disgrace to establish segregation upon the women of the nation, then Petitioner Maria will move to the U.S. Congress, as in the Dred Scott Case.

Respectfully submitted

/s/ Maria Graciela Ramirez

Maria Graciela Ramirez,
Petitioner Pro se
1517 Garcia St.
Laredo, Texas 78040
(956/723-6925)

APPENDIX A

US Court of Appeals – Dismissed ..... A 1-2

Petitioner Questions The Dismissal ..... A 3-4-5

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-21178
Conference Calendar

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. H-99-CV-4060

(Filed Apr. 11, 2000)

Before WIENER, DeMOSS, and PARKER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Maria Graciela Ramirez appeals the district court's order dismissing her civil action. Because Ramirez does not address the district court's reasons for dismissing her civil action, namely that her suit against the State of Texas is barred by the Eleventh Amendment and that she cannot challenge a state court judgment in federal court, she has abandoned the only issues before this court. *See Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner,* 813 F.2d

---

* Pursuant to 5th CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5th CIR. R. 47.5.4.

744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987). Ramirez's appeal is without arguable merit and is thus frivolous. *See Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 219-20 (5th Cir. 1983). Because the appeal is frivolous, it is DISMISSED. 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.

Ramirez was previously sanctioned in *Ramirez v. State of Texas*, No. 97-20626 (5th Cir. Feb. 26, 1998) for filing a frivolous appeal. Ramirez has nevertheless filed another frivolous appeal. Accordingly, Ramirez is BARRED from filing any *pro se* civil appeal in this court without the prior written approval of a judge of this court in active service. She is also BARRED from filing any *pro se* initial civil pleading in any court which is subject to this court's jurisdiction, without the advance written permission of a judge of the forum court or of this court. The clerk of this court and the clerks of all district courts subject to the jurisdiction of this court are directed to return to Ramirez, unfiled, any attempted submission inconsistent with this bar.

APPEAL DISMISSED; SANCTIONS IMPOSED.

Maria Graciela Ramirez, Petitioner
Questions The Dismissal And Orders

Of The United States Court Of Appeals

Fifth Circuit Of April 11, 2000 -

The United Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit, identifies the Case as No. 99-21178, Conference Calendar - Maria Graciela Ramirez, Plaintiff-Appellant -v- The State of Texas, Defendant-Appellee - Appeal from the United States District for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. H-99-CV-4060 -

Petitioner Maria questions that Dismissal of April 11, 2000 –

1. The State of Texas was never served because US District Judge Atlas moved to dismiss the case before the court clerk would send the signed summons back to Maria, so as to serve Texas. Judge Atlas, like all the state and federal judges, refuses to accept a woman as pro se before the court.

2. Maria never appealed the unjust dismissal by Judge Atlas – Maria appealed to the US Court of Appeals 5th Circuit for a transfer out of the US District Court Southern District to another Court District with an impartial judge.

3. The court of appeals declares – Because Ramirez does not address the district court's reasons for dismissing her civil action namely that her suit against the State of Texas is barred by the Eleventh Amendment and that she cannot challenge a state court judgment in federal court, she has abandoned the only issues before this court –

   It is about time that the state and federal judges learned that the Eleventh Amendment came forth in 1798 – and that on June 1980 the US Supreme Court gave individuals a broad, new right to sue state and local governments and officials using the 1871 civil rights law. Further, – Writing for the majority, Justice William J. Brennan Jr. said the 1871 law "broadly encompasses violations of federal statutory as well as constitutional law". – It is thus that Petitioner Maria backed up by the 1980 US Supreme Court

Ruling had the right to confront the state of Texas on the severe violations of rights upon Maria by the Texas courts.

4. Petitioner Maria CAN CHALLENGE a state court judgment, when state court judges move in confrontation to US Constitution Article VI (2), and segregate a woman from her rights to the Constitution and to the Laws of the Land

5. On page 2 of the court of appeal dismissal of April 11, 2000, the court declares – Because the appeal is frivolous, it is DISMISSED. – Is it frivolous when a woman is robbed of her property and of her rights by the lower courts, and petitions the high courts for "Equal Protection of the Law".

6. On page 2 of the court of appeals dismissal of April 11, 2000, the court declares – Accordingly, Ramirez is BARRED from filing any pro se civil appeal in this court without prior written approval of a judge of this court in active service. She is also BARRED from filing any pro se initial civil pleading in any court which is subject to this court's jurisdiction, without the advance written permission of a judge of the forum court or of this court. – The US Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit, as of April 11, 2000 has declared that a woman approaching the courts as pro se will be segregated from her constitutional and Laws of the Land rights and sanctions imposed – thus the women of the United States of America shall remain without Equal Rights on orders of the courts of the nation.

7. On page 2 of the court of appeals dismissal of April 11, 2000, the court declares – The clerk of this court and the clerks of all district courts subject to the jurisdiction of this court are directed to return to Ramirez, unfiled, any attempted submission inconsistent with this bar. – It is that the document signed on April 11, 2000 by the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit has devoid Maria Graciela Ramirez of all her Citizenship Rights with no protection for her life inside her ranch or her home, has devoid Maria of her right to Equal protection of the Law, has devoid Maria of her Liberty and Freedom Rights.

   It is that by documentation, signed with date of April 11, 2000, the courts of the nation remain in confrontation to the Constitution and to the Laws of the Land, in establishing segregation of rights upon a woman, whereby the Courts have taken the power to remove the citizenship rights of Maria Graciela Ramirez.

APPENDIX B

Attorneys Order To The Court---------- B1-2-3-4-5
(To defraud a woman of her rights)

Petitioner Questions the power of attorneys---------B-6-7
(To Defraud a woman of her rights)

Petitioner Before The Court----------B-8-9

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

ORDER SUBMISSION FORM

(For a Proposed Order Unaccompanied by a Motion)

RE: TransTexas Gas Corporation, et al., Debtors
CASE NO: 99-21550-C-11
ADVERSARY NO:

_x_ **ORDER SUBMITTED AFTER HEARING**
(Whether agreed or pursuant to court's request)

Hearing held on April 24, 2000

before Judge Richard S. Schmidt

____ **AGREED ORDER SUBMITTED PRIOR TO SCHEDULED HEARING**

Hearing Scheduled for _____

before Judge _____

____ **AGREED ORDER SUBMITTED AFTER A MOTION HAS BEEN FILED**

Date motion filed _____

(ATTACH COPY OF MOTION)

NOTE: When the order has been signed by the Judge, please forward a copy to:

Shelby A. Jordan
Nathaniel Peter Holzer
Jordan Hyden, Womble, & Culbreth, P.C.
500 N. Shoreline, Suite 900
Corpus Christi, Texas 78471
Telephone No. (361) 884-5678

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

IN RE:	§	
TRANSTEXAS GAS CORPORATION, et al.,	§	CASE NO. 99-21550-C-11
Debtors.	§	CHAPTER 11

ORDER

GRANTING [DOC #2525] DEBTOR'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO DISMISS DOC # 2519, Appeal No. 00-17, SECOND NOTICE OF APPEAL OF MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ AND BAR TO FILING UNAPPROVED PRO SE PLEADINGS

On April 24, 2000, came on to be considered the [Doc #2525] Debtor's Emergency Motion To Dismiss DOC # 2519, Appeal No. 00-17, Second Notice Of Appeal Of Maria Graciela Ramirez And Request For Injunctive Relief And/Or Sanctions ("Motion"); due notice having been given, and the Court, having heard the arguments of counsel for TransTexas and having considered the evidence presented, and the purported claimant Maria Graciela Ramirez ("Ramirez") having failed to appear despite receiving timely notice of the date, time, and place of the hearing; finds as follows:

1. Ramirez's Second Appeal raises no new issues beyond those issues that were dismissed as untimely filed in her first appeal.

2. Ramirez has previously filed the claim that is the subject of her attempted but time-barred appeal, or similar claims, before numerous Federal Courts in the Southern and Northern District of Texas, and in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. All her claims were dismissed.

3. On or about August 15, 1990, the Honorable Judge Norman Black of the U.S. District Court of the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, sanctioned Ramirez for filing a frivolous lawsuit. That lawsuit involved the same or similar claims as Ramirez filed against this Debtor and has previously raised in her oral arguments before this Court.

4. On or about August 20, 1991, the Honorable Judge David Hittner of the U.S. District Court of the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, enjoined Ramirez from filing any action in that Court without first obtaining leave of the Court or of the Chief Judge. Once again, that lawsuit involved the same or similar claims as Ramirez filed against this Debtor and has previously raised in her oral arguments before this Court.

5. Recently the United States Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit, in an appeal by Ramirez of an order by the Honorable Judge Nancy Atlas which dismissed yet another of Ramirez's pro se lawsuits, ordered as follows:

> " . . . Ramirez has nevertheless filed another frivolous appeal. Accordingly, Ramirez is BARRED from filing any pro se civil appeal in this court without the prior written approval of a judge of this court in active service. She is also BARRED from filing any pro se initial civil pleading in any court which is subject to this court's jurisdiction, without the advance written

permission of a judge of the forum court or of this court. The clerk of this court and the clerks of all district courts subject to the jurisdiction of this court are directed to return to Ramirez, unfiled, any attempted submission inconsistent with this bar. APPEAL DISMISSED; SANCTIONS IMPOSED."

6. The prerequisites for injunctive relief pursuant to Rule 65 and 11 U.S.C. § 105 have been satisfied, as TransTexas has a valid claim against Ramirez for harassment, frivolous litigation, abuse of process, and abuse of the judicial system, that TransTexas will be irreparable injured by the continuance of this patently frivolous appeal, and Ramirez will suffer no injury if denied an outlet to continue litigation of a patently meritless and often dismissed claim, and that the public interest will be greatly served by preventing Ramirez's further abuse of the judicial system. The Court is therefore of the opinion that the Motion should be granted; it is therefore

ORDERED that the Notice of Appeal, DOC # 2519, assigned appeal No. 00-17, filed by Claimant, Maria Graciela Ramirez is dismissed with prejudice to re-filing; it is further

ORDERED, that in accordance with the mandate of the 5th Circuit, Maria Graciela Ramirez is BARRED from filing any pro se pleading in this Court without the advance written permission of this Court; it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of this Court is directed to return to Ramirez, unfiled, any attempted submission inconsistent with this Bar.

DATED: _____.

HONORABLE RICHARD S. SCHMIDT
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

Submitted By:
Nathaniel Peter Holzer/SB# 00793971
Jordan, Hyden, Womble & Culbreth, P.C.
500 N. Shoreline, Suite 900
Corpus Christi, Texas 78471
Telephone No. (361) 884-5678
Telecopier No. (361) 888-5555

ATTORNEYS FOR TRANSTEXAS GAS CORPORATION

Maria Graciela Ramirez, Petitioner
Questions The Power Of Attorneys
That Give Orders To The Judges To
Defraud A Woman Of Her Rights –

It is that as of April 28, 2000, attorneys moved, by documentation, to ORDER a federal judge to join the attorneys in a conspiracy to defraud Petitioner Maria of her rights to Equal Protection Of The Law, and thus devoid Petitioner Maria of her Citizenship Rights.

It is that Petitioner Maria as of April 2000, was a party as Claimant in the United States Bankruptcy Court For The Southern District Of Texas, Corpus Christi Division – in Case No. 99-21550-C-11 – TransTexas Gas Corporation, et al, Debtors –v– Maria Graciela Ramirez, Claimant-Creditor

It is that as of April 14, 2000, Claimant Maria had filed a Notice of Appeal to be moved to the United States Court Of Appeals Fifth Circuit – but, the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit as of April 11, 2000, had already moved to Dismiss a previous case and given the orders to Bar Maria Graciela Ramirez from the courts, and thus, totally devoid Maria of her citizenship rights – thus, the appeal of Maria from the US Bankruptcy Court was voided.

It is that attorneys for Debtors, TransTexas Gas Corporation, et al, moved to file an Order to the federal judge, to follow the Orders of the judges of the US Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit, to defraud Maria Graciela Ramirez of all her rights to approach the courts with her

pleadings for her rights. – The Order was filed by attorneys Nathaniel Peter Holzer and associate attorneys Jordan, Hyden, Womble & Culbreth of 500 N. Shoreline, Suite 900, Corpus Christi, Texas 78471. Judge presiding Richard S. Schmidt, which judge did not sign the conspiracy order of the attorneys.

It is that in the ORDER to the Bankruptcy Judge filed April 28, 2000, the attorneys for Debtors order the Court that Maria Graciela Ramirez, Claimant be BAR TO FILING UNAPPROVED PRO SE PLEADINGS.

It is that within the document of the Order of Debtors to the Court filed on April 28, 2000 – Debtors declare that in their Emergency Motion To Dismiss – Maria Graciela Ramirez having failed to appear despite receiving timely notice of the date, time, and place of the hearing –

It is that the hearing brought on by Debtors was for April 24, 2000 and the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit as of April 11, 2000 had declared that Maria Graciela Ramirez was BARRED from the courts, so Maria Graciela Ramirez informed the US Bankruptcy Court that she had no rights to appear before any court.

Background Information On Debtors
TransTexas Gas Corp.

It is that Debtors have moved before the courts with several alias, and change their name by declaring bankruptcy.

It is that when Debtors moved into the ranch of Maria Graciela Ramirez, to drill for gas, their name was Good Hope Refineries Inc. – then robbed Maria of her

mineral gas and mineral royalties with the help of Texas judges – then moved under the name of TransAmerican Natural Gas, and robbed Maria and others of their mineral gas and mineral royalties, and Texas and federal judges protected Debtors, the Debtors declared bankruptcy again and changed their name to TransTexas Gas Corporation, and were given permission by state and federal courts to proceed defrauding claimants of their mineral gas and mineral royalties.

It is that Debtors under different alias, moved to rob Maria Graciela Ramirez of her mineral gas and mineral royalties for eighteen (18) years, with the approval of state and federal judges.

It is that, along the years, since 1979, starting in state court, Maria Graciela Ramirez has been pleading to state and federal courts for the return of her mineral royalties – but as of April 11, 2000, the US Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit has declared by Order of such Court that Maria Graciela Ramirez has no rights to approach the courts to defend her property and her rights.

Before The Court:

Petitioner Maria Graciela Ramirez approaches the Court as Pro se, when –

1. The Law of the Land, identified as USC 28, Section 1654 – Appearance personally or by counsel, declares – In all Courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel – At no place does such Law segregates women from such right to the Law of the Land.

2. US Constitution 14th Amendment, Right, Section 1 – Nor deny to any person within its jurisdiciton the equal protection of the law –

– At no place does such equal right indicate that women are excluded from such right.

3. Maria is well versed in the business and transactions of her ranch, so why bring in a lawyer that knows nothing about Maria's ranch.

4. Maria approaches the courts by the rules of the court, and speaks fluent plain English, and yet judges keep telling Maria to get a lawyer, what for –

5. Most of the cases before the courts, where Maria is the main party deal with attorneys and judges that have defrauded Maria of her rights and of her property – so no attorney will move to confront another attorney or a judge.

6. The duty of a judge is to listen, with an impartial view, to everyone equally, including a woman before the court.

7. Academically, Maria has four (4) majors in history, library, elementary education, journalism with one BS and 2 Ms.